

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.aspac.gov

	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
APPLICATION NO.	10/17/2000	Petteri Putkiranta	4925-88PUS	1591
09/646,802			EXAM	INER
7590 04/08/2004 Michael C Stuart			SMITH, SHEILA B	
Cohen Pontani Lieberman & Pavane			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Suite 1210 551 Fifth Aver	me		2681	
New York, N			DATE MAILED: 04/08/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Advisory Action	09/646,802	PUTKIRANTA, P	PUTKIRANTA, PETTERI	
. Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Sheila B. Smith	2681		
The MAILING DATE of this communication	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence a	ddress	
THE REPLY FILED 04 March 2004 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required find rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be eithe condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Ag Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114	to avoid abandonment of this r: (1) a timely filed amendme opeal (with appeal fee); or (3)	application. A proper rent which places the apple	eply to a ication in	
PERIOD FOR	R REPLY [check either a) or	b)]		
a) A months from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expoNLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the pere under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration da (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See	this Advisory Action, or (2) the date kpire later than SIX MONTHS from t WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTI The date on which the petition under the date on which the corresponder of extension and the corresponder of the shortened statutory period e Office later than three months after	he mailing date of the final rejust of THE FINAL REJECTION INTERPRISED INTERPRISED INTERPRISED INTO THE REPORT OF THE PROPERTY	ection. DN. See MPEP ppropriate extension appropriate extension nal Office action; or	
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appell 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37				
24 The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered				
(a) _ they raise new issues that would require f	urther consideration and/or s	earch (see NOTE below	·);	
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see No		•		
(c) they are not deemed to place the applicat issues for appeal; and/or	ion in better form for appeal l	by materially reducing or	simplifying the	
(d) they present additional claims without car NOTE:	nceling a corresponding num	ber of finally rejected cla	aims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following re	ejection(s):			
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) w canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	ould be allowable if submitted	d in a separate, timely file	ed amendment	
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) reques application in condition for allowance because		en considered but does N	NOT place the	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	because it is not directed SC	DLELY to issues which w	vere newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendr explanation of how the new or amended claim			ed and an	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follo	ows:			
Claim(s) allowed:				
Claim(s) objected to:				
Claim(s) rejected: 1-12.				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:				
8. The drawing correction filed on is a)	approved or b) disappro	ved by the Examiner.		
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure State	ement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)		
	· /·	· · —		



Continuation of 5, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to the applicant arguments against the references individually where the rejections are based on combination of references. The examiner further contends that the combination of the references discloses the mobile generating the location information and subsequently communicating it to the service server as disclosed in Raith et al. (6,477,362) column 1 lines 30-33

Sheila Smith 703-305-0104

ERIKA GARY ()
PATENT EXAMINE